

**R E M A R K S**

Claims 55-74 are currently pending in the present application. In the instant Office Action, the Examiner raised a number of issues, which are set forth by number in the order they are herein addressed:

- 1) Specification is objected to for allegedly lacking a complete reference to the priority applications;
- 2) Claims 55-58 and 63-74 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1-4, 6, 8, 9, 14-16, 17, 18, 22, 24, 25, 28, 33, 35, 36, 38, 40-45 and 47 of U.S. Patent No. 6,685,622; and
- 3) Claims 59-62 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Applicants hereby request reconsideration of the application in view of the forgoing amendment, terminal disclaimer, and remarks. In addition, Applicants request consideration of the references of the Information Disclosure Statement submitted herein.

**1) The Specification Refers to Priority Applications**

The Examiner has objected to the Specification for allegedly lacking a complete reference to the priority applications. Applicants must respectfully disagree. In particular, the transmittal of the instant continuation application contained a request to amend the Specification with a citation of both related applications. However, since this amendment was apparently not entered, Applicants herein amend the Specification to include reference to the two related applications.

**2 & 3) The Claims Are Patentable Over U.S. Patent No. 6,685,622**

The Examiner has rejected Claims 55-58 and 63-74 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims of the parent application, which has since been allowed as U.S. Patent No. 6,685,622. Applicants must respectfully disagree. However, in order to further their business interests and the prosecution of the present application, but without acquiescing to the Examiner's arguments, Applicants herewith file a Terminal Disclaimer (Tab A) to overcome any obviousness type double patenting rejections.

In addition, the Examiner has objected to Claims 59-62 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Applicants have not amended Claims 59-62 at this time, since the Terminal Disclaimer submitted herein should be sufficient to overcome the rejection of the base claim. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections and objections of Claims 55-74 be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. However, should the Examiner believe that a telephone interview would aid in the prosecution of this application, Applicants encourages the Examiner to call the undersigned collect.

Dated: September 16, 2004



---

Christine A. Lekutis  
Registration No. 51,934

MEDLEN & CARROLL, LLP  
101 Howard Street, Suite 350  
San Francisco, California 94105  
415.904.6500